

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **1.) Claim Amendments**

The Applicant has amended claims 4-6. Accordingly, claims 4-6 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 4, 5-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the invention.

The Examiner stated that “Protocol 802.11i is indefinite.” The Applicant respectfully disagrees. The specification describes 802.11i as, “a forthcoming version of the standard, IEEE 802.11i, [that] addresses improvement of Security.” As such, and based on the above description, the Applicant believes the term 802.11i is not indefinite.

The Examiner stated that, “Regarding protocol 802.11x, the specifications do not describes what the term x means...therefore it is indefinite. For purposes of examination, the examiner will consider x as variants of the protocol. E.g., 801.11a, 801.11b, etc.” The Applicant would like to point out that in one embodiment, IEEE 802.1x is actually an IEEE standard for port-based Network Access Control and is part of the IEEE 802 (802.1) group of protocols. It provides authentication to devices attached to a LAN port, establishing a point-to-point connection or preventing access from that port if authentication fails. As such, Applicant has amended claim 4 based on the above description of 802.1x which is supported by the specification.

The Examiner stated that, “The examiner is not sure as to what the applicant means by a 802.11i wireless station...For purposes of examination, 802.11i is considered as a device in a wireless LAN.” The Applicant would like to point out that in one embodiment an 802.11i wireless station is a STA that is using or that can use 802.11i.

Per the information presented above, the Applicant respectfully believes the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections should be vacated.

### 3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henry, *et al.* (US 2003/0172144 A1) in view of Immonen, *et al.* (US 7,010,305 B2).

Currently amended claim 4 discloses a wireless access point (AP) operative to perform authentication for both legacy and 802.11i wireless stations, wherein:

if an 802.11i wireless station is encountered by said AP:

the AP performs an 802.11i association and authentication;

an 802.1x enabled switch is accessed for the 802.11i wireless station and traffic from the 802.11i wireless station passes through the switch without filtering; and

if a legacy wireless station is encountered by said AP, said wireless station initiates a login procedure with a Public Access Control gateway (PAC).

The Examiner rejected the prior version of claim 4 based on Henry's paragraph [0007] which states: "(4) Using a static IP address or DHCP over link-layer access control and encryption mechanisms, such as 802.1x and 802.11i in the case of an IEEE 802.11 wireless LAN. This method offers good security protection (assuming the WEP security flaws are fixed by 802.11i), but suffers the same routing efficiency problem if the majority of communications occur between IP hosts associated with the same access point." As can be seen, Henry merely mentions that 802.1x and 802.11i are encryption mechanisms.

The Examiner also rejected the prior version of claim 4 based on Immonen. The Applicant respectfully disagrees that Immonen is related art to the prior version of and to the currently amended claim 4. Immonen discusses assigning values of service attributes to various transmissions. As can be seen, Immonen merely discloses providing Quality of Service (QoS) attributes.

Neither Henry nor Immonen, nor any of the other cited art, alone or in combination teach or suggest a wireless access point (AP) operative to perform authentication for both legacy and 802.11i wireless stations, wherein: if an 802.11i wireless station is encountered by said AP: the AP performs an 802.11i association and

authentication; an 802.1x enabled switch is accessed for the 802.11i wireless station and traffic from the 802.11i wireless station passes through the switch without filtering; and if a legacy wireless station is encountered by said AP, said wireless station-initiates a login procedure with a Public Access Control gateway (PAC).

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Roger S. Burleigh, Reg#40542/

Roger S. Burleigh  
Registration No. 40,542

Date: June 26, 2007

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-5799  
roger.burleigh@ericsson.com